

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-7 have been allowed. Claim 24 has been amended into independent format in a non-narrowing manner. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 8-10, 14, 15, and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Meginnis (U.S. Pat. No. 3,864,199). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that each of the elements of each of the rejected Claims is taught by Meginnis.

Claim 8 recites, "said skin is spaced a distance from said member to define a coolant conduit . . . a coolant disposed in said coolant conduit". Meginnis simply describes that air can pass through the pores defined in a portion of the device in Meginnis. Meginnis does not disclose that a skin is positioned a distance from a member to define a coolant conduit in which a coolant is disposed.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Claim 14 includes patentable subject matter. Meginnis does not disclose a coolant pressurizing system. Meginnis simply discloses that air can pass through the pores defined in a layer of material. Thus, Meginnis does not teach a pressurizing system. Further, Meginnis appears to teach away from a pressurizing system as Meginnis discloses that the flow of the air is directed by an angle which is enters the structure. Thus, a pressurizing system would upset such a flow.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite, "forming a selected pore in a structure to allow a substantially unidirectional flow of a coolant". Meginnis discloses only that an angular flow of a material will be created because of the flow of the material into the device. Meginnis does not teach or even suggest that an opening formed in any portion of a device would allow for a substantially unidirectional flow. Thus, amended Claim 17 should also be in condition for allowance.

Applicants request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' representative, noted below, if each of the presently pending claims are not in condition for allowance.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 1-7 are allowed and that Claims 11-13, 16 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of Claims 1-7.

Applicants have amended Claim 24 into independent format including each of the limitations from the claims from which it depended. Thus, Claim 24 should also be in condition for allowance.

Regarding Claims 11-13 and 16 Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and the objection to these Claims. Although the Applicants have not amended these Claims at this time, Applicants reserve the right to do so in the future to place them in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1-19-06

By:   
Michael L. Taylor, Reg. No. 50,621

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDE/MLT/jb